

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, and 8-10 are amended. Upon entry of the amendment, independent claim 1 with claims 2-10 depending therefrom, independent claim 11 with claims 12 and 13 depending therefrom, and independent claim 14 with claims 15-20 depending therefrom are pending in the application. Claims 11-20 are allowed.

Claims 1-10 are amended to correct any 35 U.S.C. § 112 issues properly raised by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 2 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,414,801 to Roller (Roller).

Claim 1 recites as follows:

1. An anticollision beacon comprising:
 - a generally cylindrical, thermally conductive support having an axis and a bottom surface;
 - a plurality of LEDs mounted in thermally conductive relationship to said support, each of said LEDs having an optical axis;
 - a plurality of reflectors secured to said support, said reflectors defining openings for each of said LEDs, said openings located in an open ended radially oriented trough defined by the reflector; and
 - a thermally conductive base including a support surface for mounting said support in thermally conductive relationship to said base, wherein said support and said base provide a thermal pathway for heat generated by said LEDs, and the optical axes of said plurality of LEDs are substantially perpendicular to said support axis.

Roller does not disclose, teach or suggest an anticollision beacon wherein "the optical axes of said plurality of said LEDs are substantially perpendicular to said support axis" as recited in claim 1. Roller discloses a catadioptric light emitting diode assembly intended for use as a daytime running lamp on motor vehicles. The LED assembly of Roller includes PC boards 40 to which LEDs 41 are secured. The PC boards are supported in axially spaced relationship by connecting members 50. Each LED of the

Roller LED running lamp assembly is arranged beneath a collimating lens to refract light from the LEDs 40 to a direction substantially parallel to the optical axes of the LEDs. The collimated light of from the LEDs of one board are then radially distributed by reflection off a reflecting surface 71. The Roller LED running lamp assembly, as best shown in Figure 2, teaches a structure for supporting a plurality of LEDs and distributing the light from the LEDs that is very different from that required by claim 1. Roller does not disclose, teach or suggest the structures or relationships recited in claim 1.

Claim 1 is patentable over Roller for at least these reasons.

Claims 2-10 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the reasons stated in support of claim 1.

Claim 2 recites "a cup-shaped lens configured to cover said support, said LEDs and said reflectors and mount to said base, wherein said base includes a peripheral heat radiating surface not covered by said lens." Claim 2 recites structural and functional relationships not disclosed, taught or suggested by Roller. Claim 2 is patentable for at least this additional reason.

Claim 7 recites "wherein said openings are located at a radially inward most point of said trough and said troughs are segmented into semi-parabolic reflecting surfaces centered on each LED." As previously discussed, Roller does not disclose, teach or suggest trough reflectors meeting the limitations recited in claims 1 and 7. Claim 7 is patentable for at least this additional reason.

Claim 8 recites "wherein said reflector troughs define segmented reflecting surfaces with each segment centered on an LED." Roller does not disclose, teach or suggest the recited reflector troughs of claims 1 and 8, the relationships between the recited reflector troughs and the plurality of LEDs. Claim 8 is patentable over Roller for at least this additional reason.

Claim 9 recites "said trough defining a reflecting surface configured to redirect said axially remote light into a direction substantially parallel to a plane including said

• Appl. No.: 10,718,772
Amdt. Dated November 23, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 24, 2005

optical axes." Claim 9 recites structural and functional relationships that are not disclosed, taught or suggested in by Roller. Claim 9 is patentable over Roller for at least this additional reason.

Claims 3-6 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Roller. As previously discussed, Roller does not disclose, teach or suggest the structures or relationships recited in claims 1-10. Claims 3-6 and 10 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the reasons stated in support of claim 1.

Claims 3-6 and 10 further recite specific structures and relationships that are not disclosed, taught or suggested by Roller. Claims 3-6 and 10 are patentable over Roller for at least these additional reasons.

Claims 11-20 were previously allowed by the Examiner.

For all the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 1-20.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding these Amendments, or wishes to discuss this matter, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS M. FREDERICKS et al



Thomas J. Menard
Registration No. 42,877
Alix, Yale & Ristas, LLP
Attorney for Applicant

Date: November 23, 2005
750 Main Street
Hartford, CT 06103-2721
Our Ref: WEN/274/US
TJM:io

G:\AYR saved docs\Filing Docs\Wen\wen.274.us\wen274us.response.doc